Thus the ancient Epicureans and Democritics argued ; there being nothing incorporeal but space, there can be no incorporeal Deity*

But, because this seems to give advantage to the Thei&ts, in making space something, or that which hath a real nature or entity without our conception, from whence it will follow, that it must qeeds be either itself a> substance* ©r else a mode of some incorporeal substance; the modern Democritics are here more cautious, and make space to be no nature really existing without us% but only the phantasm of a body, and, as it were, the ghost of it,, which has no reality without our imagination. So that there are not two natures of body and space, which must needs infer two distinct substances, one whereof must be incorporeal, but only one nature of body. The consequence of which will be this, that an incorporeal substance is all'one with aa incorporeal body, and therefore nothing.

viu. But because it is generally conceived, tbatan error cannot be sufficiently confuted, without discovering TO amov *rov* i/*v§ovc, the cause of the mistake;—therefore, the Atheists will, in the next place, undertake to shew likewise the original of this doctrine of incorporeal substances, and from what misapprehension it sprung; as also take occasion, from thence, further to di&* prove a Deity.

Wherefore they say, that the original of this doctrine of incorporeal substances proceeded chiefly from the abuse of abstract names., both of, substances (whereby the essences of singular bodies, as of a man or a horse, being abstracted from those bodies themselves, are considered uni-